

HAS JESUS LIVED?

A REPLY RESTING UPON HISTORICAL
AND DOCUMENTAL TESTIMONY

BY

PROFESSOR VON SODEN D. D.
OF BERLIN.

TRANSLATED BY MARGARET L. CLARKE.



PRICE: 9 d. net.

Protestantischer Schriftenvertrieb

G. m. b. H.

Berlin-Schöneberg 1911

Sole Agents for Great Britain and the Colonies:
Williams and Norgate, London.

FS 2 FS 2
So 15 So 15C

In unserem Verlage erscheint:

Protestantenblatt

Wochenschrift für den deutschen Protestantismus

Herausgeber: Pfarrer D. Max Fischer, Berlin
und Pastor R. Emde, Bremen

1½ Bogen stark mit wöchentlichem Beiblatt: „Zur
kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte“ und monatlicher Beilage:
„Missionsblatt“

Preis 1,50 Mark für das Vierteljahr
durch den Buchhandel, die Post oder den Verlag selbst

Das „Protestantenblatt“ dient dem freien Christentum in den evangelischen Kirchen Deutschlands durch allgemeinverständliche Besprechung aller sittlich-religiösen Fragen, die in unserer Zeit jeden ernsten Menschen in Kirche und Staat, in Erziehung, Schule, Wissenschaft, Literatur und Kunst beschäftigen, wie durch sorgfältige Berichte über die wichtigsten Vorgänge und Ereignisse auf religiösem und kirchlichem Gebiet im In- und Auslande.

HAS JESUS LIVED?

A Reply resting upon Historical and Documental
Testimony.

By

Professor Herrmann von Soden.



Protestantischer Schriftenvertrieb
G. m. b. H.
Berlin-Schöneberg 1911

Sole Agents for Great Britain and the Colonies:
Williams and Norgate, London.

PROTESTANT
LITERARY
SOCIETY
LONDON

BS

480

P624

1911

~~F\$2
So 15 C~~

11806

Contents.

	Page
Introduction	5
1. Non-Christian Testimony	8
2. The Gospels of the Christians	11
3. St. Paul as Witness to the Life of Jesus	21
4. The Jesus of the Pre-Christian Period	27
Conclusion	38



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

<https://archive.org/details/hasjesuslivedrep0000sode>



Has Jesus lived? Is there any doubt about it, most people will say! What fact is more firmly established in universal history than the appearance of Jesus? It marked the close of one epoch and the beginning of another. Are not the after-effects of His appearance still mighty and have they not been so for nearly two thousand years? Is not this proof enough? Was not Jesus the motive power in every initiatory movement of this "Christian" history? When we call to mind the figures of the past is there one who stands out more vividly and of whom we have a more life-like and touching picture than of Him? Is not the individuality of the figure too striking to permit of its being an invention? What is left to us from the past if He is rejected?

Let us confess it at once: we are quite as justified in asking if Jesus has lived as we are in putting the same question with regard to Socrates or Alexander. An experiment with these two will bear out what I mean. We have no proofs, emanating from themselves, that they have lived; they have left no written work behind them. Why should Socrates not be worldly wisdom personified, the idea of the philosopher in human shape. Plato may have created this ideal figure of a philosopher, that is to say, if the dialogues handed down to us under his name, are really from him. Who can bring a certain proof of this? In the Greek circles, which were interested in philosophy, there may have been — long before Plato presents Socrates to us — such a mythological figure, who was venerated as primeval philosopher and hero of the schools. His name means "possessing salvation", "lord of salvation". The word "Jesus" has the same meaning. Socrates, the Greek Jesus; Jesus, Socrates transformed into a Jew. It is not astonishing that "uncritical" historians have often drawn a parallel between the two. The truth is that they are identical, they represent the same mythological figure of a Saviour. Plato gave literary form to this figure four hundred years earlier in his Socrates and, as a true Greek, endowed him with all the attributes of a philosopher. Paul, or his predecessors, embodied the figure in their

Jesus, but their Semitic spirit led them to represent him as the Saviour God wearing the form of man. Besides this the picture of Socrates that Plato gives us is so entirely different from the one Xenophon brings that no historical person can be meant. The only reasonable way of regarding these two irreconcilable pictures is to consider them as free creations of the two very different minds of Plato and Xenophon.

It is much the same with Alexander. He is the personification of victorious power, the Greek Siegfried, the ideal centre, the intellectual leader of the group of commanders who, at the same time, founded different kingdoms, all bearing a Greek character. We are told that they divided his imaginary dominions amongst themselves. Here too the name betrays the meaning. Alexander means: the repulser of men. And do we not see united in him the figures of Apollo and of Achilles? Thus he is a youthful embodiment of the Greek spirit. Is he not spoken of as strong, invincible, and also beautiful? He ends by being the personification of the victorious march of the Greek spirit through Further Asia. The fable then demands his sudden death in Babylon, a mythological expression for the fact that the Greek wave of culture which had swept, unopposed, over the lands of Further Asia, at last dashed itself in vain against this stronghold of old Asiatic culture.

The doubt as to whether Jesus has lived is, indeed, not to be taken more seriously than such trifling with airy combinations. We might pass the question by if it were not that it concerns Jesus, who has more to say to us today and means more to us than a Socrates or Alexander. The latest attempt, too, to deny the historical character of Jesus, has caused such a great and undeserved sensation and has apparently found so many followers that we cannot refrain from taking notice of it.

This attempt is not the first of its kind. Similar endeavours which lie farther back, have indeed long since faded from our memory. Then we have the idea of an Assyriologist — promulgated by him only a few years ago — that Jesus was the hero, turned into a Jew, of the Babylonian national epic, Gilgamesch. This idea, too, made and left no lasting impression. On the other hand, the very latest advocate of the non-historical character of Jesus has his immediate predecessor in the late Pastor Kalthoff of Bremen. Kalthoff had tried in vain, and from every point of view, to understand Jesus, and in the last years of his life he proceeded to expunge His existence from history altogether. And we must say in his favour that he had his material much more in hand, and had thought out his hypotheses from every side with much more acumen and seriousness than had his successor. But whether it was that Kalthoff was an "apostate" theologian, or, that the current of the time was not in his favour, or, perhaps, that he did not travel about

to spread his views; any how, it was denied him and reserved for Mr. Drews — the most zealous advocate we have of the philosophy of Edward von Hartmann — to raise the question, whether Jesus has lived, into one of the questions of the day which has excited the deepest interest in the widest circles. In his book, "The Christ Myth," Drews undertakes to explain how the picture of Jesus in the Gospels arose out of the ideas of the time, and the needs of the time. He will demonstrate that the testimony for the historical character of Jesus is not worthy of belief. The author is bound to make a favourable impression on the reader and to gain his confidence. He puts forward such a mass of learned material, as almost to confuse us. He points out that every thing he has adduced has been said by others before him.

It is no wonder that this assertion that Jesus has never lived caused deep excitement in all classes of society, and was everywhere greeted by those who would like to do away with Christianity altogether. For if the founder of Christianity was no historic person, then, according to general opinion, there is no truth in the Christian religion, and this means, for most people, that there is no sense in any religion, nor has religion any claim on us at all. But the consequences are still more far-reaching. Our confidence in all tradition and in reason in history is deeply shaken. If Jesus never lived the whole civilised world has lain 2000 years long under the spell of a delusion; it has been the victim of a deceit. The Christian religion, which has overcome the world and never failed to bring civilisation in its train, then rests upon a bold combination of mythological ideas, only fashioned into a picture of life by false or fantastic spirits. And so little does man exercise his faculty of reason that, till now, nobody has noticed how deficient this fictitious person is in flesh and blood and, indeed, in everything necessary to existence. More than this — and this is probably the reason why those who are imbued with monistic and materialistic ideas would like to see the figure of Jesus disappear from history — it would then be demonstrated, and that in the most striking place in history, that the opinion we hold of history being made by individuals is but a superstition.

The following statements will not be influenced in any way by these general points of view and personal interests. They shall only serve to show their importance for everyone. The question will be put simply as a historical one. It will also be investigated solely with the expedients and according to the method of historical research. Therefore all arguments resting upon personal experience or upon convictions, borne in upon us in any way whatever, will be carefully excluded. We shall not ask how the individual explains this historical appearance,

or what his position is with regard to it. We shall leave out of the question the reliability of the details given us by tradition about the course of His life, the wording of His sayings, the individuality of the person of Jesus. We deal only with one question: has Jesus lived?

1. NON-CHRISTIAN TESTIMONY.

The first authority we are able to cite is the information gleaned from the works of the non-Christian writers of the first Christian centuries. It is a well-known fact that the harvest is an extremely scanty one. How should it be otherwise? Their records tally with the Christian Gospels only in the most general outlines. In a quite unknown corner of Palestine—shut off to this day from communication with the world—and in a quite unknown little Jewish country town, a Jewish Rabbi is heard of. Till then he had been a workman and lower-class citizen. This Rabbi created a sensation among the people of this out-of-the-way neighbourhood, and for a short time had many followers. Then he went to Jerusalem, accompanied by his faithful band, and was there some days or weeks. The leading classes of his people made the Roman governor believe that the teaching of this man was pernicious, and he was executed. This story, in its bare outlines, was an almost daily event of that time. What Roman or Greek historian would have heard of it, or if they had, would have taken any notice of it?

Even when the movement found its way into the Roman Empire it was at first submerged by the innumerable religious societies of the period; especially as its followers were principally of the lower classes. But still we hear of this movement twice, and both times a certain, historical person is mentioned as the founder and soul of the new sect.

Suetonius (about A. D. 120), in his life of the Emperor Claudius, speaks of the Emperor having “banished from the city Jews, who, led by a certain Christ, were constantly causing disturbances”. This must have happened about A. D. 50. The historian of the Emperor knows, therefore, that a certain historical person had been the cause of a fierce dispute. He errs only in assuming that Christ was in Rome then. This error arose, perhaps, from the belief of the Christians that Christ was in their midst in spirit and worked in them.

Tacitus (about A. D. 110), the well-known historian of the Roman Empire, and the possessor of a punctilious historical conscience, in speaking of the famous fire of Rome under the Emperor Nero, relates the following (*Annals* 15, 44): Neither works of charity, nor largess, nor the many acts of the Prince to dispose the gods in his favour, cleansed him (Nero) from the vile suspicion of having set the town on fire himself.

To silence this report, Nero laid the blame upon wicked persons, called Christians, who were generally hated for their evil deeds. This name is derived from a certain Christ, who was put to death by the governor Pontius Pilate, under the reign of Tiberius.¹ For the moment the pernicious superstition was suppressed. But it broke out again. Not in Judea only, where this evil had begun, but also in the metropolis, where everything that is horrible and shameful collects and finds supporters. All who confessed to being Christians were first seized; they informed against the others, of whom a great multitude were taken prisoners. However they could not be convicted of incendiarism, but rather of general hatred to mankind. They were condemned to death, and their execution afforded a pastime for the people. Many of them were wrapped in the skins of animals and thrown to the dogs. As the day waned they were used as torches. Nero gave his garden for this spectacle, and arranged circus games to which he came disguised as a charioteer. He was to be seen driving his chariot or he mingled with the people. The Christians were certainly guilty and deserved the severest punishment. But still compassion was felt for them; for people said they were not sacrificed for the welfare of the state but were the victims of the cruelty of an individual." Drews doubts the genuineness of this passage and cites, in support of his theory, the name of a French scholar, who is quite unknown to us in Germany. But it is impossible that the paragraph can have been inserted later by Christians. The style is so inimitably that of Tacitus, and also the contempt of the aristocrat for movements among the people. Christians would certainly, as they always did, have represented Early Christianity in a more favourable light, in giving it its chronological place in any work of history they happened to read. But Tacitus, on account of his whole attitude and his difficult style, was not read at all by the Christians and, therefore, scholars unanimously consider that his text is the most genuine of all the writings of antiquity which have come down to us.*)

¹ Drews declares, in this connection, that the whole story of the persecution of the Christians by Nero was a late Christian legend, of

*') The following interpolation — undoubtedly the work of a Christian — in the history by Josephus, (*Antiquities* 18, 3, 3), may be given as a characteristic example of the manner in which Christians supplemented the historical works which they read: "At that time lived Jesus, a sage, even if he is spoken of as a man. He was, indeed, a doer of wondrous works, a teacher of mankind, who received from him the truth with joy. And he drew to him many Jews and many of the Greek world. He was the Christ. And even when our elders accused him to Pontius Pilate, who punished him with death on the cross, those who had first loved him did not forsake him. For he appeared to them alive three days later as the holy prophets had prophesied. A thousand other wonders had they also prophesied about him. And the generation of those who are called after him Christians has not died out to this day."

which there is no record in the second and third centuries. To show how reliable the statements of Mr. Drews are, we need only mention — as witnesses for the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, and many other persons in Rome — the letter of Clemens of Rome, A.D. 96; a note of Dionysius of Corinth, A.D. 170; and the more or less detailed remarks of Zephyrinus and of Caius in Rome and of Tertullian in North Africa at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. Then too we have the testimony of Eusebius, the well-known Church historian, from the beginning of the fourth century.⁵

What about the Jewish writers! May we not expect them to speak of Jesus? Yes, if we only possessed such writers from whom we might reasonably hope for information. But if Philo, the Alexandrian philosopher and contemporary of Jesus, had ever heard of that time of enthusiasm and fanaticism among the lower classes in Palestine, it would have been far beneath his notice. Josephus, the friend of the Romans, and a man who on principle never burnt his fingers, wrote three voluminous works in Rome: The History of the Jews; The History of the Last Jewish War; and a Defence of the Jewish Nation. They were written after the Jewish War, in which he had taken part, and after Jerusalem was destroyed and the Christian community scattered. Josephus' object was to do away with the feeling of contempt with which the Romans regarded the people they had conquered. We can understand his not touching upon the episode of the appearance and execution of Jesus. It did not concern the history of the Jews. Nor was it worth his while to speak of Christianity. At the time when he wrote it had almost died out as a Jewish sect — in any case, as such it had entirely lost in importance. On the other hand, in the Roman-Greek world, Christianity was spreading, and was the subject of much contention. Any expression of opinion, on his part, would have been taken ill by one side or the other. We may say the same thing of Justus of Tiberias, whose works are lost. The later Jewish collections of expositions of the law by famous Rabbis may not, with any certainty, be considered as contemporary. The oldest collection, called "The Sayings of the Fathers", only contains moral sentences; therefore it has as little to do with our question, as an anthology of Goethe's sayings — appearing in the present day — would have to do with the question whether Frederick the Great had ever lived. To consider this anthology as a work from the period of Frederick the Great would be just as wise as to ascribe the above-mentioned collections to the time of Jesus and of the earliest beginnings of Christianity.⁶ Jesus is occasionally mentioned in later paragraphs of the Talmud, of course in as unfavourable a way as possible, but no doubt is ever expressed as to his being a historical

person. On the other hand, the Christian apologist, Justin, A. D. 160, brings a controversy about Christianity in one of his writings. It is carried on by a Jew, called Trypho, who is certainly drawn from life. He brings forward the sharpest arguments and objections against Christianity, without doubting that Jesus ever lived. Celsus, the Greek, the bitterest enemy of Christianity, who lived about the same time, produces a Jew as an accomplice, who asserts everything that is base and infamous of Jesus, calls Him a vagabond, imposter, magician and so on, but does not with a single word doubt His existence. Therefore non-Christian witnesses can only be called upon to testify that Jesus was a historical person; against this fact they can never give evidence.

2. THE GOSPELS OF THE CHRISTIANS.

* About A. D. 100, according to our reckoning, the Four Gospels of our New Testament were partly in existence, partly coming into existence. They are the only detailed reports which have come down to us of that Jesus, whose historical character is impugned. In the first case it is certain that their authors were convinced of His having lived. The Gospels are not intended as poetical compositions; as, for example, the songs of Homer, or the Nibelungen. Their intention is to relate history. The writers, however, do not consider themselves bound to the form in which it has been handed down to them, but quite simply claim the right of ordering and selecting the single narratives and sayings as they think best. They will relate and embellish the different scenes according to their own taste, or their own point of view. In doing this they are certainly guided by the wish to make what they write as clear, intelligible, and impressive as possible to the reader. In this way and in no other was "history" written by the entire Old World. The historical feeling of the ancients did not require that every individual expression and every scene should be rendered in exactly the same form in which tradition had handed it down; nor did they expect that the historical occurrences should be given with the accuracy of legal documents. For them the report was a true one if it correctly gave the significance of the proceedings, the sense of the conversation, the character of the personality. This peculiarity of all old historical writings is overlooked by those who think themselves justified in doubting the historical character of a fact when there is difference or discrepancy in the many reports concerning this fact. ▲

Our historical sense has, indeed, developed quite differently. We require the exact wording of the expressions, the correct rendering of the facts. This brings us to the so-called historical and literary criti-

cism of the accounts which have come down to us from antiquity. We inquire as to how near in point of time these records stand to the facts; we ask what led to their being written down, and we compare the different accounts, if such exist. Our final endeavour then is to disentangle the original and simple facts of the case from these accounts. In so doing only the ignorant will speak of forgeries, and allow themselves to be influenced by preconceived distrust of the truth of the reports.

We need only glance into our Gospels to see that their authors followed that method of writing history which was common to the whole ancient world. If this were not the case the Christians would never have been so simple as to place together these Four Gospels — which often differ in detail and even contradict one another — nor would they have presented them as documentary evidence of equal worth concerning the life of their Lord. It remains for us to discover the facts lying at the bottom of these accounts. Science has worked at this unweariedly for more than a century; again and again have new ways been sought for, again and again have results been arrived at which, in some measure, differ from one other. Till now the question was only: What certain details have we of the life of Jesus? How can we picture His personality? And, what seemed more important, how do we explain this personality? What is our position with regard to it? But now comes a much more radical question: Has this Jesus ever lived? Is this fact given by the Gospels as beyond all doubt? Let us then examine them from this most general point of view of all. But we will not, as Drews did, examine a number of narratives, which offer points of attack to doubt, or, according to his opinion, seem to do so, we will examine the whole picture of His life.

Critical investigation of our Gospels has, first of all, established the fact that the three first, called the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke, give the original picture less coloured by the conception of the author than does the Fourth Gospel, that of St. John. In conducting our inquiry we will therefore leave the Fourth Gospel on one side. Now the accounts of the three First Gospels show so many points of contact that the conviction of their being nearly related to one another has become universal. The manner of this relationship has been the principle subject of the most searching inquiry. This inquiry has, at the present time, yielded two, almost universally acknowledged, results.

One of these results is that our Gospel of St. Mark is the oldest, and forms the basis of the other two more voluminous ones—St. Matthew and St. Luke. The Gospel of St. Mark has also been made use of in writing the Gospel of St. John. This appears to weaken the position, as we no longer have four independent witnesses who 'corroborate one

another; what is most important is traced back to one witness alone. But, in reality, the picture only becomes clearer. First of all, the alterations effected by Matthew and Luke in their model, the Gospel of St. Mark, in weaving it into their own Gospels, does not render us suspicious of the historical nature of St. Mark's Gospel, nor of the confidence reposed in it by the other two Evangelists. The diversities are to be explained by their somewhat different interests, and are, indeed, mostly unavoidable, as their own Gospels are constructed from a different point of view. Besides, these alterations have principally to do with the style and sequence of the narrative, not with the material, though there are occasional divergences which slightly affect the picture presented.

Now we have an interesting record given us by the Christian Church historian, Eusebius, whom we have spoken of before, and who lived at the beginning of the fourth century.⁴ Eusebius tells us that he had read in one of the writings of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, (about A. D. 150), that John, "the Elder of Ephesus" — known also to many others — had informed Papias that this Gospel of St. Mark was the work of Mark, the helper and companion of Peter, and contained narratives which Peter had communicated to him. There is no reason for doubting the veracity of this tradition, even if we confine it to a part of the material which is woven into a whole in our Gospel of St. Mark.⁵

⁴ The second accredited result of Gospel research is the existence of a collection of sayings of Jesus, which, with other additions, is made use of by the writers of the First and Third Gospels — each according to his own method — in their version of the Gospel of St. Mark. The same reliable tradition attributes this collection of sayings to one of the twelve disciples — the only one, probably, who had any literary education — Levi-Matthew, the former collector of taxes in Capernaum (St. Mark 2, 13—17). We also learn that these sayings were originally written in the language Jesus himself spoke: Careful comparison of their rendering in St. Matthew and in St. Luke has made a reconstruction of this collection possible in the main points — details are unimportant for our purpose.

We have therefore at our disposal two documents for the Gospels preserved to us telling of the life of Jesus: this **Collection of Sayings**, compiled — according to an old tradition — by Matthew, one of the companions of Jesus, and incorporated in our Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Then we have a series of stories, contained in the Gospel of St. Mark, and, according to the same old tradition, written down from the narratives of Peter, the oldest and leading disciple of Christ, by Mark the friend and companion of Peter.

But we will pass over the tradition with regard to the authors, even though it is plainly and reliably attested, and allow the documents to speak for themselves.

The first thing we see clearly on placing these two "primitive Gospels" side by side is that they have been composed quite independently of one another. Looked at as a whole their material is quite different; the one Gospel principally brings sayings, the other, for the most part, events. And if they do record the same incident, the form in which it is given is so different that a dependence of one upon the other is quite out of the question. We need only compare the accounts of the assertion that Jesus was in league with the devil in St. Mark 3, 20—30 and in St. Luke 11, 14—28. Or the request made to Jesus for a sign in St. Mark 8, 11—13 and in St. Luke 11, 29—36. Or the sending forth of the disciples in St. Mark 6, 7—13 and in St. Luke 10, 1—24.

On the other hand it is all the more significant that these two entirely independent accounts are most nearly related in the matter which they recount. We find the same circumstances surrounding the life of Jesus, we hear of the same places and social conditions. It is the life of the lower-class citizen of Palestine, which is reflected just as vividly in the events reported, as in the figurative language and parables of Jesus. It is the same clear, detailed painting of experiences. The manners and customs are the same in daily life, in the following of a trade or profession, at home, as well as in religious and moral views and arrangements: We see the workman on the market-place, the woman kneading dough, the wine being put into leather bottles, the clothes worn by rich and poor, the principal article of food, the different sections of the people, the different trades, the manners of society, fasting, the washing of hands before meals, the strict rules for the observance of the Sabbath, the conditions prevailing in the Synagogue, the state of politics, the leading classes, the characteristic figures of the Pharisees, publicans, scribes, high priests, the various kinds of disease. All this and much more we are made acquainted with, generally by casual remarks, and with a few bold strokes. We are favourably impressed from the very first, and all the more so as, one at least, of the accounts, that of St. Mark, was written down in Rome. This we know from reliable tradition as well as from the colouring of the language. And yet we only find traits peculiar to great part of Palestine, even to Galilee. The writers had kept them fresh in their memory and uninfluenced by any associations of the Greek-Roman world, let alone of the capital, Rome. And what of Jesus Himself in the midst of this motley, concrete world. This above all: it is the same language He speaks everywhere, His interests are always the same. It would be impossible

to invent His manner of expressing His thoughts. The plastic, figurative language is so entirely free from all abstractions, the judgments and convictions are formulated in short, pithy sayings which strike us at once and induce reflection. The kingdom of God is here, as elsewhere, the centre-point of the thoughts. But nowhere do we find a definition, in both cases a picture is given in parables taken from nature and human life.

And in both accounts the picture of the Speaker bears the same characteristic features which we all know so well. And this is the more remarkable as it is no clear, simple, characteristic picture which is given, nor is it merely the outline, neither is it a personification of various virtues, such as the personification of wisdom, or philanthropy, or angelic patience or religious fervour.¹ On the contrary, the individual traits of the picture do not easily blend into a whole. But the difficulty is not caused by our finding one trait recorded in one document, and another trait in the other. It is much more the case that when difficulty arises in reconciling the different traits, this always occurs in the same document. How often has the attempt been made to depict these traits, either in words or in the lines of a human face. And what are the traits? Simple humanity and deep feeling, susceptibility and ardour, together with a lofty calm and serenity. He is master of the situation as well as of the people, He stands high above them all. Sometimes He is mild, sometimes severe; now all peace, again eager for combat; in one place full of respect for tradition, in another He sweeps it on one side. Now His own people are His horizon, and again His outlook is the wide world. But one thing is always the same: this Jesus belongs to everyone who approaches Him trustfully and in need of help. He understands them all. The soul of man and the life of man are reflected in His eyes as are the light and the landscape of Galilee. And yet His inmost being is high above this world and the people in it, above the struggle and the turmoil of life. His soul lives and moves in God, breathes the breath of God's pure peace. And yet it is the picture of a feeling, human soul, it is no God, who soars like a vision above the world, unsullied, beyond our reach, announcing truths in the manner of oracles borne on the air from another world. Everything is evolved from, is steeped in circumscribed, concrete reality, which breathes of earth and of its limitations.² The Jesus of these two primitive Gospels — although in the narratives of St. Mark He frequently oversteps the bounds of the purely human — has nothing of the character of a mythological figure, of a deity, of a fantastic figure fashioned by soaring faith. In His whole appearance He is man, entirely man; He is weary, hungry, He sleeps, questions, rejoices, trembles, weeps, is angry, He is conscious of the limitations of His power as of His knowledge.

It may be said that some of the narratives bear a legendary character; on the other hand, many are closely connected with such individual sayings and conflicts that it would be impossible to invent them. Doubt may be felt, in spite of this, with regard to all the miracles. But how have these entirely concrete traits found their way into a mythological picture which, as Drews thinks, is intended to represent to us a Saviour God whose only deed is to die for the salvation of men? What did the Christians in Ephesus, or Corinth, or Rome know or care about all these names of places in Galilee: Capernaum, Chorazin, Bethsaida, the Lake of Gennesaret, Gadara, Decapolis, Cesarea Philippi, not to mention Bethlehem and Nazareth which were much more likely to be considered fictitious. What was the use of giving the names of all these persons — mythological interpretation was quite out of the question here — the names of the twelve disciples (St. Mark 3, 16—19); of Joseph of Arimathea (St. Mark 15, 43); of "Simon of Cyrene, father of Alexander and Rufus" (St. Mark 15, 21); of Simon the Leper (St. Mark 14, 3); of Mary, called Magdalene, of Joanna the wife of Chuza, of Susanna (St. Luke 8, 2—3)? Why are all the peculiar customs of the Jews related in such detail? They were so foreign to the Christians, for whom these Gospels were written, that the Evangelists had to explain them in part, as, for instance, the washing of hands before meals (St. Mark 7, 1 *); the custom of fasting (St. Mark 2, 18*); the narrow-minded rules with regard to the keeping of the Sabbath (St. Mark 2, 23*); the Jewish marriage laws (St. Mark 12, 18*)? The Jesus of the Gospels rejected all these customs, and therefore they in no way helped to give the mythological figure more concrete, Jewish traits.

And now we repeat the question — mooted before — this time with reference to the world in which this picture has its place, with reference also to Jesus Himself, His speeches, and His interests. How is it that this picture — if it is fictitious — has no Hellenic features, no touch of the philosophical language, of the mode of thought and of the interests of the Greeks. As we know, the picture received its written form in the midst of the Roman-Greek world, it was written down for the Roman-Greek people.

It was composed for the Christians, is the reply given. Well and good. Why then is there no touch of the Pauline conception of Christianity, no reflection of the Pauline Lord of Glory? According to Drews, St. Paul was really the cause of this fictitious life of Jesus being composed. In reading it everyone feels that the Jesus of the Gospels speaks quite a different language from Paul in his letters and from all the other

*) And the following verses.

Early Christian writers. To give another example: when Jesus in the Gospels opposes the Pharisaic conformity to the law, why is there no trace of the Pauline manner of denying the authority of the law for the Christians? And again, why is the expression "the Son of Man" only used by Jesus and is never found in the writings of the Christians? Why is the central idea in the preaching of Jesus, the "kingdom of God", so rarely found in the Epistles? Further, the little interest shown by the other New Testament literature in the details of Jesus' life on earth has always excited comment. — Of this we speak later from another point of view. — Is it probable that at this time and in these circles there was anyone whose imagination was indefatigable and creative enough to construct a life of Jesus, and to invent all these remote details? We might bring ourselves to accept this theory if we were to suppose that in these Christian communities — which lived apart for themselves — there were two intellectual currents, flowing side by side, separate and non-communicating. One current created the picture of Jesus and the sayings attributed to him, and the other found uniform expression — in the main point — in the other Early Christian writings. But this contradicts all we have ever heard of the oneness of the Christian communities of that day, as well as the fact that these Gospels were written in different places.

¶ We are thus led to the conclusion that the material forming the subject of the Gospels of the Christians consists of a number of historical facts woven together. It is impossible to discover a mythological source for this material, it serves in no remote way to give vitality to a mythological figure. The peculiar arrangement of the material also speaks for its historical origin. The two oldest authenticated documents, of which we have spoken before, the Gospel of St. Mark and the collection of sayings, agree most remarkably in this respect: their inter-relation is apparent without being intentional. But the colouring of the narratives, the moods which find expression in the sayings, throw into strong relief, in both documents, the stages of development in this life of Jesus. First there is the simple, quiet beginning in a small circle on whom an overwhelming impression is made; increasing success follows, and, in like measure, increasing opposition; objections are raised, which have nothing at all to do with the later doubts of the Christian faith; then, in spite of slander and misrepresentation, there is a further increase of success till a movement takes place among the masses. Here we are again surprised by the very exact geographical statements ("And a great multitude from Galilee followed him, and from Judaea, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumaea, and from beyond Jordan; and they about Tyre and Sidon." St. Mark 3, 7). Then comes a complete reaction, Jesus

is gradually deserted, He is no longer a Teacher of the multitude but of His faithful little band of followers. He journeys to Jerusalem, there the enthusiasm of the people flares up once more, to be followed by a sudden collapse. What part could these varying stages play in the poetical representation of a God sacrificing himself for man.

But now to the main point: What reader of the Gospels is not deeply impressed by the perfect uniqueness, the actuality and originality of the picture of Jesus. And it will always be easier for us to understand the appearance of such a great personality than to accept the theory that unknown men met secretly, imparted their dreams and ideals to one another, and then, out of nothing, created a harmonious, life-like picture, perfect in line and perfect in form.

People may say: I cannot imagine such a personality. This argument does not hold good in the face of the difficulties encountered in explaining the picture of Jesus in the Gospels as a poetical fiction. If we did not know that Napoleon I and Johann Sebastian Bach had lived we would be quite as justified in declaring that there could not be such an incarnation of brutal force as Napoleon was, such a heartless, demoniacal ruler of men; nor such a many-sided musician as Bach, with his mastery of sound and his inexhaustible fertility. This man only lived in the imagination of others, we would say, his works must be divided among a number of persons, legend only has ascribed them to one single one. But if — as Drews does — in speaking of the sayings and parables of Jesus people cite the Old Testament collection of the Psalms, which are all attributed to David, and the Proverbs, which are all ascribed to Solomon, the comparison has not a leg to stand upon. The most different spirits speak in these Psalms and Proverbs, there is no spiritual unity in them at all; a much later period traced their origin to one single person who had lived many centuries earlier. But in the sayings and parables of the Gospel there is the same spirit, the same original, figurative language. And Jesus, He to whom they are ascribed, is said to have lived but a few decades before, not in the grey dawn of the ages, as did David and Solomon. And with many of these sayings it is thought that the occasion on which they were pronounced is known to us. Here too we shall hear the objection: "these occasions are proved to be of a fictitious nature." This may sometimes be probable. But still they are often of too individual a nature to be invented. We think of the reproach made to Jesus that He was in league with Beelzebub (St. Mark 3, 22, St. Luke 11, 15); or the anxious question of the imprisoned Baptist if Jesus were He that should come (St. Luke 7, 18—20); or the parable of the vineyard and the husbandmen, which arose out of the situation of the moment (St. Mark 12, 1—12); or the words of Jesus when He

was contemned of his countrymen in Nazareth (St. Mark 6, 1—6); or when His mother and brethren came to fetch Him home, because they feared He was beside Himself (St. Mark 3, 21, 31—35).

The originality and actuality of the writings has thus been established from every point of view, but what about the argument that these sayings were written down too long after their utterance to permit of any claim to authenticity. Let us not forget that at this time and in the country of their origin all teachers relied more or less upon their memory. And again — and this has never been disputed — the sayings of Jewish Rabbis, written down many centuries later, are found to have retained their original wording.

There is no historical sense in the argument that our recollection of our grandparents is often very indistinct, and that legends quickly grow up about the lives of great men. The latter argument need not be rejected altogether with regard to Jesus. But the "great man" still remains as the nucleus round which the legends have collected. And grandparents are not great men. If we are closely pressed, we confess we know nothing about them, but we do not call our imagination to our aid.

"The lively imagination of the Orientals, their notorious unreliability, their lack of historical feeling, their typical incapacity to grasp and render any subject objectively" has been brought forward as another argument. But their memory is known to have been excellent, trained, and tenacious with regard to names of places. Those Jewish generations were notoriously unproductive, and the form of the sayings and of the parables of Jesus is so plastic that they stamp themselves indelibly even on our weakened, modern memory. We may call it a psychological impossibility for a figure, which is so clear in outline, so instinct with life, and devoid of anything fantastic, which lives and moves amid the concrete realities of earth to have been invented in those days of Rabbinical hair-splitting and Jewish quibbling. Added to this, the creators of these Gospels, as well as the authors of the New Testament Epistles, are so conscious of their lack of initiative that they always seek a model and a copy which they may work by and follow. And there is something else. The Gospels, as well as the Epistles, reveal that the Early Christians primarily found proof for their belief that Jesus was the Messiah in the agreement of the historical picture with the prophecies. This it was that excited their deep interest and not the historical events. How came they then to produce such a great number of historical pictures, which are nowhere prophesied, and also a picture, which, regarded as a whole, is the sharpest contrast to all prophecies as they were then interpreted? It is certain that the author

of these Gospel writings intended to arouse the belief that Jesus was the Christ. But we see everywhere how difficult that was in the face of tradition which would not harmonise with the assertion: Jesus is the Christ. How often, for instance is this Jesus, the Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount, nothing but a religious teacher of morals. And an important question: Where does the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels appear as a Saviour God, though the Christians were all convinced of His being their Saviour. We do not find this once in the collection of sayings. In the Gospel of St. Mark it is only clearly expressed in one single, obscure text, and here it is only given as a comparison or as a model for the injunction laid on man that one should be the servant of the other, St. Mark 10, 45: "For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

What about the last objection that, down to the present day, we do not know what was most important in the preaching of Jesus, nor what was most individual in His personality; and also — as Drews tellingly observes — that the most opposite movements claim Jesus as their Master? Is not this much more a proof in favour of the historical character of Jesus, and against the supposition that the inventor of this figure and the authors of our Gospels were guided by certain needs and certain tendencies? No, what was found in this Jesus — when the whole impression was brought to bear — did not always occupy a prominent and central place in the many, and various sayings and events. And yet tradition was adhered to. The picture therefore became ambiguous, in spite of the perfect unity in this diversity. And how is it with Goethe? Is he not claimed as their hero by nearly all the movements of the present day, by the intellectual aristocrats, by the men of action, by realists and idealists, by the followers of Monism and of Social Democracy? And there are quite as many different opinions about the fundamental thoughts in Faust as there are about the spirit of Christianity. And yet Goethe did live and what we assert about him rests upon accredited documents. And we may also say that it was he and he alone who wrote Faust.

To conclude and to sum up: sundry of the narratives may be objected to on account of their kinship with traditions from other religions; that has nothing to do with the debate. If, however, we do not — as Drews does — ignore all the other narratives, then we find the accounts in the Gospels rich in matter which nullifies all attempts to prove they are of legendary, or mythological, or fantastic origin, or have arisen out of the needs of the Christian belief. No other explanation is possible: these accounts are historical facts.

3. ST. PAUL AS WITNESS TO THE LIFE OF JESUS.

Our New Testament is a collection of the earliest Christian literature and, in addition to the Gospels from the Early Christian period, contains letters addressed to Christian communities by different, leading Christians. It also brings a description of the spread of Christianity in the first generation, the so-called Acts of the Apostles. This last work and the Gospel of St. Luke are by the same author.¹ In the missionary sermons of the Apostles references to the history of the life of Jesus are relatively scanty, and, when they occur, attach importance to the purely human side. There is no trace of any mythological basis. For instance, we read that Peter says to Cornelius (Acts 10, 38): "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him." And again, when he upbraids the Jews (Acts 2, 36): "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." It is self-evident that it was a human life that was originally meant and that only faith saw something that was higher.² In the Epistle to the Hebrews too there are distinctly human traits in the picture of Jesus. In the Fourth Chapter, Verse fifteen, and in the Fifth Chapter, Verses seven and eight, the author says: "For we have not an high-priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and has been made perfect." This is not the way in which one speaks of a God in human shape. But here it may be urged that the literature of the Evangelists was then in existence, and what was touchingly human in their accounts was likely to be coloured more highly by the imagination of the pious.¹

It is, however, different in the Epistles of St. Paul. They offer such strong testimony for the historic Jesus that — till Drews came — no one ventured to deny the historical character of Jesus without impugning the genuineness of St. Paul's Epistles. Indeed, nobody has as yet been able to explain how these Epistles came to be written in the second century. Their author writes, in the deepest excitement, of far too many things which the Christian communities of the second century no longer took seriously. This we know from other, dependable

documents of the period. Their language is that of the Rabbinical Schools, which nobody would have understood at that time. They are addressed to different communities, and show us, in these communities and in the life of St. Paul, a motley variety of concrete situations, which are quite unimportant for the ostensible tendency of the supposititious letters. And, in the first place, they give us a picture of St. Paul, by whom the Epistles are said to have been written. We are shown such a striking, individual, characteristic personality, one who feels keenly and has so many purely personal connections, together with such powers of mind and religious fervour, that to consider the Epistles as written with a certain purpose and by an author under an assumed name would be to be confronted with a riddle and a miracle for which we can find no analogy, and offer no explanation.

The most important Epistles of St. Paul — which we also need for our inquiry — are therefore permitted by Drews to pass as testimony to the religious views of the most important and successful representatives and propagandists of the new Christian religion.

But he maintains that St. Paul had no historic Jesus in his mind. He would only present to the imagination, in as human outlines as possible, the Saviour God, Christ, whom he announced. The "historic Jesus" was, Drews says, created after the time of St. Paul, and arose out of the misunderstanding of the Pauline representation of the Heavenly Being and Saviour in human form.

St. Paul could scarcely be more misunderstood. It is true that, in the Epistles of St. Paul, little interest is shown in the details of Jesus' career. And here we are encountered with a difficulty. But it can be met quite differently and much more easily than by Drews' assertion that Jesus was no historical person for St. Paul. It is true that he had not known this Jesus personally, he had never come under the influence which His life exercised upon men. He only became a Christian when convinced that that Jesus, who had been executed on the cross as a blasphemer, was indeed the Christ. He maintained this himself and his immediate followers believed and preached the same. Why else should he — as he relates in the Epistle to the Galatians 1, 18 — after being converted to this faith, which he had before persecuted, go up to Jerusalem for fifteen days, in spite of the danger attending such a journey, to speak with Peter, and James the Lord's brother, if it had not been that they had known this Jesus and could give an exact account of Him?

The Epistles themselves testify that St. Paul knew more of Jesus and related more in his missionary sermons than he does in his letters. In writing to the Corinthians about the proper celebration of the Lord's

Supper he adds these words to what he says with regard to the manner of its establishment (1. Cor. 11, 23): "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread", and so on.

He exhorts the Philippians to take Jesus for their model, reminding them: "He humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross." He recalls the time of his Mission work to the Galatians (Galatians 3, 1), "Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you". Does not this presuppose that the receivers of the letters had a fairly exact knowledge of the life of Jesus? He frequently speaks of the Twelve, that is, the twelve disciples of Jesus; of "James the Lord's brother" (1. Cor. 15, 5,7; Galatians 1, 19; 2, 9, 12). It was reserved for Drews to give a new rendering of the supplementary words "the Lord's brother" — although Peter's name stands by James — he says James was the best Christian and most like the Lord! St. Paul too often refers to the words of Jesus. It is remarkable that they are not words contained in our Gospels, and that he does this in speaking of relatively unessential truths. This is, by the way, a new proof that the collection of words of our Lord in the Gospels can scarcely be invented, as the community would have sorely needed such words to support their own position. According to Drews, the expression "words of the Lord" is proved to have been used in the ancient world, to designate the rules of the patron of a religious community. He has, however, brought forward no proof for this.

We see from various passages in the Epistles, from St. Paul's entire range of thought, and also from his conversion that it was just the human nature of Christ he would dwell upon. St. Paul had no intention to write of an ideal formed by men; it was rather of a purely human existence that he would treat.

His conception of salvation through Christ demanded the perfect humanity of Christ. The sin committed in the flesh must be punished in the flesh. Therefore, he explains to the Romans (Romans 8, 3), "God sent his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," that is to say in the flesh taken by the Son. And He was put to death on the cross in fulfilment of the Old Testament law: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Galatians 3, 13). His blood must be shed, for through blood we have salvation, and redemption (Romans 3, 25, 29; Colossians 1, 14). Jesus must also be placed under the law to redeem those who were under the curse of the law. Thus in the most decisive passages of his writings St. Paul always lays emphasis upon Jesus becoming man. He writes to the Galatians 4, 4: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son,

made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." In his great Epistle to the Christians in Rome, who were unknown to him, he declares in the introduction (Romans 1, 3) that the Gospel which he announces treats of "his (God's) son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh". In picturesque language he exhorts the Corinthians to take the coming of Jesus into human existence as a pattern for their giving freely to the collections for the Christians (2. Cor. 8, 9): "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." His language is still more picturesque in exhorting the Philippians to humility and in pointing to Jesus as their model (Phil. 2, 5): "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." We can see how vividly these human conditions of Jesus' life are impressed upon his mind by a passage in 1. Cor. 15, 4, where he expressly mentions that, after Jesus died, he was buried. In the face of such sayings how is Drews going to uphold his assertion: "The whole of Jesus' life on earth had no interest whatever for St.Paul."

But when it happens that Paul in his Epistles, does not give details about Jesus' life on earth, when writing of questions of the day in the Christian community, of the consequences of the appearance and the work of salvation of the Son of God become man for the life of His own people, it is because Paul knows that this Jesus is risen and near to him, filling him and ruling him with His own spirit. He feels so closely linked with this his risen Lord that he declares: "Not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2, 20), "For me to live is Christ" (Phil. 1, 21). But, for him, this risen Christ is no other than this Jesus, and the reason of his being certain that He is now about to complete His work is that He had appeared on earth as Jesus to begin it by His death. He becomes a Christian from the moment he is assured that this Jesus who was crucified by the Jews was unjustly crucified, and that he had unjustly persecuted the followers of this crucified one; and after having, as he solemnly declares, seen "Jesus Christ our Lord" (1. Cor. 9, 1). And not only did he see Him but, according to his solemn account of the appearances of the risen Lord — an account which is drawn up almost like a legal document — "He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once"; and then Paul adds: "of whom the greater part remain unto this present" (1. Cor. 15, 1 and the following verses). The figure must then have had certain, well-known features, which made the appearance recognisable as Jesus. Drews feels this so strongly that he resorts to

an expedient which serves his turn when in need: he declares that this notice is added later. And he goes on to say that tradition tells us nothing about this appearance before a great multitude, and such a thing could not possibly have been forgotten. But if this was unknown to everybody till then, it is also not likely that this notice could have found its way, unopposed, into such an important passage in the Epistle of St. Paul. We theologians, in great part, believe this event to be well attested, even if we modify it — and our modification would not have greatly differed from the views held in that period — by saying that in the place of the transfigured Lord appeared the spirit, accompanied with heavenly light. And here the influence of an older tradition is visible: the events on the day of Pentecost recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

The position on which St. Paul stands is much more that he is well informed with regard to the historic Jesus. He and most of his pious Jewish contemporaries had long believed in a Christ, resolved upon in the councils of God, living in Heaven as God from the beginning — we theologians call this pre-existent — and working in many wonderful ways and appearances in Old Testament times. The coming of this Christ into the world was their fervent desire. But now he is sure: Christ has come into the world, has become man, has taken flesh and blood. Jesus was Christ, and as man of flesh and blood He has, by His death, delivered men from sin and death: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." And so his belief in Christ has its root in this Jesus. Therefore his favourite formula is "Jesus Christ"; a better translation would be "Jesus the Messiah", or, we read quite as frequently "the Messiah Jesus". And this Jesus gives concrete substance and features to his picture of the present Christ, who would so soon come again. But it does not seem to have been easy for him to recognise in this Jesus the Christ — or as he likes to say — the Lord. This was a form of expression which was more easily understood by the Greeks. To get thus far had been hard work, had cost him many a struggle. And so he assures the Corinthians (1. Cor. 12, 3): "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." This is a proof that the Christian form of confession was: "Jesus is the Lord."

In the Acts of the Apostles we have an exact description of Paul's mission work among the Jews in the Synagogue. We read: "this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." (Acts 17, 3.) And in the next generation the position remains the same: thus in the First Epistle General of St. John 5, 1 is written: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." And in the same Epistle 4, 2: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God."

Or in the Second Epistle to Timothy 2, 8: "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead." The First Epistle to St. Peter 4, 1, also relates that "Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh", and quotes Him as an example for all those who suffer in His name (2,21 and the following verses): "Christ also suffered for us leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." And it is much the same in the Epistle to the Hebrews 12, 2: "Let us run with patience the race that is set before us looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame." The author reminds us that this "Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (13, 12), and expands one of the Early Christian confessions of faith, Jesus is the Christ, into the solemn chant: "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday (that is to say, in the days of His life on earth), and today, and for ever" (13, 8).

We must therefore turn Drews' thesis upside down, then it will be correct. For Paul, as well as for all the Christians, whose confessions are collected in the New Testament, the historic Jesus is the cardinal point, or, as one of them says (1. Peter 2, 7), the corner stone of their whole position.

And just because they never feel obliged to go into details about His life on earth, even when they have to defend their faith, proves that it was never disputed that Jesus had lived, but only if this Jesus was Christ. And yet, if Drews is right, the opponents of the new faith could have settled the matter as easily as possible. They had only to produce documentary evidence — and surely this would not have been difficult in Paul's time and for his bitterest enemies, the Jews of Jerusalem — showing that Jesus had never lived and therefore that the Christian belief was entirely without foundation. We must only keep in mind that all orthodox Jews had long believed in a Christ, and in His coming into the world. They were all agreed that there was a Christ, the dispute was as to whether this fervently longed-for Christ had really come down from the heights above and had appeared among men. But in their expectation of Him they by no means considered it a matter of course that He would appear entirely as man. It was much more the case that they dreamed of a heavenly vision in the clouds of the sky, upon a white steed, or something similar, and accompanied by the hosts of heaven. What the Christians asserted was quite different from these Jewish pictures of the future. The Christians believed that this Christ had

appeared, and only yesterday, in that Jesus who had come among the Jews as the simplest of men and had died the death of shame on the tree.

Thus Primitive Christianity is entirely unanimous in its testimony to the historical character of Jesus.

THE JESUS OF THE PRE-CHRISTIAN PERIOD.

It devolves now upon those who do not consider that the witnesses we have brought forward give sufficient evidence for the historical character of Jesus to explain how and from where this fictitious picture of Jesus found its way into the beginning of the Christian, religious movement, and also how this fiction could bring about the universal and uncontested conviction that this Jesus was the founder of Christianity and had lived in Palestine at a certain and near period. Drews' point of departure: St. Paul wanted to place the Saviour God in human outlines before the imagination, and to endow the picture with all the attributes of an ideal human figure is confuted by the proofs given in the preceding section. St. Paul paints no ideal picture of a man, he had no wish to see and to show just the human features in his Christ; the spirit of Christ was before his mind's eye, was living in his soul. Drews also lays stress upon this, but his intention, in so doing, is to expunge the historic Jesus from St. Paul's world of thought. But this spirit of Christ bears the name of Jesus, that is to say, St. Paul knows that this spirit was in Jesus. What is confusing for us is that it is not this Jesus but Christ upon whom all his interest concentrates.

This name of Jesus is the stone lying in the way Drews wishes to lead us. But Drews knows how to remove the stone. "Among numerous Jewish sects, Jesus was only another name for the Messiah." "We find, from the beginning of Judaism and co-existent with the priestly and officially recognised Monotheism, a belief in other gods, which belief appears to have been held by secret sects."[†] It is honest of him that he at least says "appears". For we really know nothing, positively nothing, of this belief in other gods, prevalent in Jewish, secret sects. We do know of a belief in angelic beings, also of a belief in the invisible, far-distant, eternal God giving, in some way, a sign of His presence, a manifestation of His person: we hear of His voice, His glory, His reason. We also know of intermediary beings whose duty is to bridge over the gulf between these appearances and men, and to bring life and movement into the rigidity and stillness of their strict, monotheistic belief. The Oriental manner of designating ideas as concrete realities led to these revelations of the inscrutable God, who dwelt beyond all worlds, taking the form of such intermediary beings. They are the

reflection, the mark of His glory, the picture, the Son of God. But they are never gods. They are divine, because they represent God, not because they are gods beside Him. We can never speak of a belief in other gods existing among the Jews.

But Drews knows more than this. "To these conceptions also belongs the belief in a second god, or demi-god Jesus, who manifestly dates from a very early period before the establishment of Christianity. We look in Drews' book in vain for a proof that this was "manifestly" the case. What he alleges is only the following.

An Englishman, of the name of Robertson, not the famous one, has endeavoured to prove that Joshua, who is known to us all as the successor of Moses and the conqueror of the land, is really an old Ephraimitic god of the sun. Even when we concede this hypothesis, which has not yet been fully developed, how are we to account for this sun-god appearing in the oldest history of Israel as the successor of Moses, as the leader of the people, and the conqueror of the land. And how and when — we will leave the time of the rise of Christianity quite out of the question — was Joshua transformed into a god and accepted as such by the Jews. We possess not the slightest trace of all this. And instead of bringing forward a proof, Drews says "manifestly!" But, according to his notions, the belief in a Jesus-God (instead of Joshua which is, indeed, the same root, slightly modified) must have been widely spread at that time, and therefore should be known to us.

Drews has something to relate about such secret sects. First he mentions the "Jessaer". Unhappily we know nothing at all about them. The name can only be derived from Jesse, the father of David. Therefore it has positively nothing to do with Jesus. Perhaps it was a sect which believed in the Messiah and expected Him, as the son of David, to come of the root of Jesse or Isai (compare 1. Sam. 16, 1. Romans 15, 12).

But it is primarily of the fraternity of the Therapeutae, living in Egypt, that he speaks. Compared with the "Jessaer", fairly detailed accounts are preserved to us of this sect. They were hermits who built their huts not far from one another, occupied their days with study, and on certain days held a solemn repast, followed by a festival at night. In Philo's detailed account of their life and manner of thought there is not the slightest hint given of their sharing the hopes of their people with regard to the Messiah, let alone of their expecting a future king, or even, as Drews boldly declares, of their having a god, called Jesus, whom they worshipped and possibly considered the Messiah. Drews says not a word as to whether the Messiah had appeared, or was expected by them in the future. But when Drews goes so far as to de-

clare that the meaning of the name Therapeutes is doctor, saviour, and is the Greek translation of the word Jesus, we know better. It means one who reverences God and has, therefore, positively nothing to do with the import of the word Jesus.

We possess a hymn from a Christian-Gnostic sect, called Naassenites, who are attested to have lived in the second Christian century. This hymn describes how Jesus, in the heavenly world, begs His Father to send Him down to the human souls, wandering in darkness, to bring them salvation. We have no proof that there were Naassenites before the time of Christ, though it is not out of the question. But there is no ground at all for supposing the hymn to date from that period. It is quoted by one of their Christian adversaries as being in use at the time he wrote, that is to say, in the second century. Lastly, the Nazarenes, whose name is again attested as being that of strict Jewish Christians living only in the Christian period, are to serve as king's witness for a Jesus of the time before Christ. Nazarene is, in some way or other, to be brought into connection with "Nazoraer" and possibly "Nasiraeer". But here we find ourselves in a dark and obscure region, into which light will perhaps never entirely come; the misunderstandings and confusions caused by the resemblance of the names are too many and great. Drews again takes the experiment of scholars as attested truth and will, with them, explain the name Nazareth as being fabricated from Nazarene or "Nazoraer", whereas no such place really existed. But it is a doubtful circle in which this hypothesis moves. Till now, we thought Nazarene came from Nazareth, or Nazara, as the name is also handed down. It is easier to form the word Nazarene from this latter rendering. Now it is to be the contrary! Nazarene is to be a corrupt form of "Nasiraeer" whose origin we know, or "Nazoraer", the derivation of which is at least easy to guess. And Jesus is to have been a "Nasiraeer" or to have been called a "Nazoraer". But how did the corruption of these two, possibly original, words, come about, if Nazareth did not exist? And how was the connection established with this corrupted word, and why, in order to explain it, was the fictitious Jesus made to live in a fictitious place? It gives the whole story an air of improbability from the very beginning. And how could the story permeate tradition so quickly? Was the cult-god Jesus perhaps revered by the "Nasiraeer", were they called by the people Nazarenes, did the god of their worship receive the name of Jesus the Nazarene, and did there then arise the fiction of a Utopian Nazareth, which was the city of this cult-god? Were not the Early Christians able to ascertain if there was a Nazareth? And how was it that the god of Nazareth sank to the carpenter of Nazareth? And why, in spite of all this, is Caper-

naum "his city" and not Nazareth? And how and when was a real city of this name subsequently founded in a remote part of the country? And why is it that only Jews dwelt in this city which was founded in the interest of the Christian myth? Epiphanius, a writer of the fourth century, was astonished to find the city inhabited only by Jews. So many questions, and so many impossibilities!

³ Not the slightest documental proof is therefore preserved to us of the existence of a Jewish hero of a sect, who was called Jesus. But Drews brings another proof to speak for the spread of the worship of this entirely mysterious god. This proof is the rapid growth of the religious communities believing in the Jesus-Messiah. He thinks the solution of this mysterious riddle is to be found in the widely-spread worship of a pre-Christian god Jesus among the Jews of the Roman Empire. But authenticated history supplies us with a simpler explanation than this fabricated hypothesis. The Jews of this time, as we have said before, were tensely expectant of the appearance of the promised Saviour, the founder of God's kingdom. And in those days of the universal "dawn of the Gods", and of the deepest inward dissatisfaction, the people of the heathen world everywhere hoped and longed for a Saviour. They expected Him in every new Emperor. Those who were not content with the Roman conditions repaired in crowds to the Jewish synagogues of which there was one in nearly every town. They were attracted there as much by the Jewish, spiritual belief in God, their solemn services, their wonderful, profound, old narratives, as by their writings of the Prophets, and their hope of the Messiah. It was no wonder that believers were quickly found when the tidings came "the Saviour has appeared", and when the picture of Jesus was painted, and the death on the cross described in connection with all kinds of old myths of dying gods, with the widely-spread idea of the atoning power of blood, and with the mysterious words of the Old Testament.

⁴ There is then no truth in the story of the god Jesus, who was worshipped by a Jewish sect. It is different however with Drew's second source, accepted by him as the origin of the "Christ myth". We all know that the idea of dying gods who bring salvation by their death and rise again from the dead is to be found in many religions. It is one of the most profound ideas of the pre-Christian world, and is connected with the appearances observed in the sun and moon, in the rising and setting, the waxing and waning, together with the processes of nature in the change of the seasons. It is further developed in observing the laws which regulate human life and, according to which, the one must sacrifice himself for the other and the hero for the multitude. Drew's

formula that the Christian myth is a combination of the Redeemer Jesus of a Jewish sect, and of the heathen Saviour God who offered up himself as a sacrifice, is, indeed, faulty, as we have seen that there was no Saviour Jesus, revered by a Jewish sect.⁷ Added to this the entire Early Christian literature contradicts the possibility of the Christian belief in the saving power of Jesus' death on the cross being only another form of the heathen idea of a self-sacrificing god. The reason for this is that Jesus on the cross was not looked upon as a god, at least, not by Primitive Christianity. St. Paul would have to have created this idea. But here again, the representation of a Saviour God, which would be of the utmost importance, is wanting in his writings. St. Paul's whole range of thought, as we have already shown, is occupied with the "Man" Jesus, who, in as much as he became man, effected salvation, but is no god, who dies as God. It was necessary to explain this transformation. God has sent Jesus and sacrificed Jesus, that is his idea. And it is the same in all the early Christian writings. We never hear of a god, who sacrifices himself, but of the man Jesus, whom His followers called the Christ and who, in direct opposition to everything that was said of this Christ, was hanged on the cross so that His own people were in danger of losing their belief that He was the Christ. It was of serious importance that this riddle of a crucified Christ should be solved, that this surprising decree of God should be explained. St. Paul knew from his Mission experiences that it was "unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness" (1. Cor. 1, 23). It must appear so to them, if they did not wish to doubt Jesus. If, on the other hand, those mythological ideas were the source of the entire Christ drama, where was the offence? Were they known to those who now dramatised them in the "Christ myth", why did the New Testament writers make so many different attempts to explain why this death was necessary and in what way it could bring salvation? And why does St. Paul, instead of making use of those mythological ideas, refer to the Scriptures: "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures" (1. Cor. 15, 3). What is the reason of the express search for all kinds of analogies and causal connections to solve the riddle presented by the idea of the substitute, by the meaning of the sacrificial offering, by the connection of sin and death, and the claims of Divine justice, while there is not the slightest allusion anywhere to those mythological thoughts? We learn nowhere from tradition that, when these thoughts prevailed, the worshippers of such a self-sacrificing god, whether it were Adonis, or Mithras or any other, made any endeavour to explain the primeval, mythological idea. From a psychological point of view it would have been quite incomprehensible. Myths are believed in,

they speak for themselves. Facts have to be explained, because at first they are inconceivable.

There is something else to be said. If the idea of the self-sacrificing god were the source of the "Christ myth", why do the believers in the myth relate that Jesus had just been sacrificed, in the time in which they themselves lived. Myths belong to the grey past, never to the present. They ought to have announced that they had discovered an old story. They ought never to have begun: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria" (St. Luke 3, 1). They should not have continued: "Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea etc." (St. Luke 3, 1). Or: "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king" (St. Matt. 2, 1). Those were times that were still known and stood out in history much more clearly for the Early Christians than they do for us, if we do not happen to be scholars. Culture was at its highest then and Palestine also came under the influence of its enlightening rays. Those are no times for myths. Drews is as unhistorical as possible when he asks: "Why cannot that happen with Jesus which happened with Moses (he means the free invention of the figure of Moses, an hypothesis which is still sharply contested)? He forgets that this Moses is said to have lived in the first, faint, glimmering dawn of the history of the people of Israel, many, many hundred years before the time in which it is attested he was spoken of. Jesus, on the other hand, lived at a time when the events of the day were enacted before the eyes of millions of clear-sighted, educated people, in a literary period of the first rank. Drews even has the courage to bring forward the Tell legend as an analogy for his Christ myth. He probably forgets that Schiller took from times far remote a meagre legend founded upon one single occurrence. He recast this legend and made out of it a picture of life which, in concrete colouring and variety of figures, may perhaps be compared with the story of Jesus told in the Gospels. It is unnecessary to say that Schiller did not suddenly change the "once upon a time" into "today".

Drews goes on to say that a part of the worship, the centre-point of which was the myth of the God Saviour offering himself as a sacrifice, consisted in the sacrifice of a doll or a living criminal. The latter, of course, was only the case in early, barbarous times. How then did it happen that the sect, which is said to have worshipped the mysterious Jesus, suddenly sacrificed their Jesus god at their festival, not figura-

tively, but himself, in the body, in flesh and blood, and before all the world? And how did they come to represent him as executed by the Jewish and Roman authorities of the day? And if they had taken no doll, why did they not at least report that, according to the barbarous customs of their worship, a criminal had been executed in the place of their god?

Pure impossibilities, of which the mythologist has no perception.

The greatest impossibility, however, is the picture which has been drawn of Jesus' life even if, for Drews, it is plain sailing. "If St. Paul declared the god Jesus was man idealised, there could be no difficulty in painting this picture of Jesus." "All that had to be done was to transform the myth into a biography, and the material of the Gospels was, in the main point, to hand." "There is nothing in the Gospels which may not have arisen in this way." "It is so simple, all difficulties disappear at once, if we think of Jesus as God in human form; the material then only has to crystallise round the figure of the worshipped Jesus instead of round the historic Christ." But what is to be done when this worshipped figure, as we have shown, is a phantom? For the process of crystallisation a solid nucleus is necessary. "The sources are of such a nature that a real historian cannot be a moment in doubt — unless he examines them with the conviction and intention of finding a historic Jesus — that here is a religious fiction, a myth in historical dress, which, in principle, in no way differs from other such myths or legends — we have only to think of the Tell legend."

Some of the Gospel narratives may permit of such interpretation, but Galilee has certainly nothing to do with the Saviour myth, nor Capernaum either. And why must the self-sacrifice of the god be transferred just to Jerusalem and be changed into a judicial murder, brought about by means of a legal procedure at the instigation of Jewish fanatics? We have heard enough of other shameful deeds of theirs at this period. Drews admits that this mythical material was native to Syria, to the neighbourhood of the great city of Antioch, in the figure which, in some features, was akin to the picture of Jesus. But what is the explanation of the fact that Pharisees, scribes, and the high priests of Jerusalem brought this god, who had appeared in Galilee, to the cross? And why did his nature so revolt that, in Gethsemane, this self-sacrificing god wrestles in prayer with his God, and breaks out on the cross into the despairing cry: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

To go back. Why were brothers and sisters, mentioned by name, given to this Saviour God (St. Mark 6, 3), why was it thought He could only heal when the unbelief of the people did not prevent it (St. Mark 6, 5), why was it imagined that His own mother thought Him

beside Himself (3, 21)? Why is He sometimes tired and then departs to a solitary place to speak with His God (1, 35, 6, 46)? Why does He weep at the grave of His friend (St. John 11, 35)? Why is He given all the genuine, human features, of which we have before spoken (p. 20)? Why do the Evangelists permit this God to declare: "there is none good but one, that is, God." (St. Mark 10, 18)? Or that the place on His right hand and on His left in glory is not His to give (10, 40)? Or that He does not know of the day and hour of the coming of the Son of man, only the Father knoweth that (13, 32)? And why are all these many Galilean stories given? They in no wise characterise a cult-god, nor have they the remotest connection with the self-sacrifice of any god whatever. They are all of a purely human character, as, for instance, the conversations about fasting, or the keeping of the Sabbath, or that Jesus sat at meat with sinners and what He says of them (St. Mark 2, 18—22. 23—28. 13—17. St. Luke 7, 36—50), or the detailed description and appreciation of John the Baptist by this God Saviour (St. Luke 7, 18—35), or even notices, like the list of certain women who ministered to Jesus (St. Luke 8, 1—3)? The list of the Twelve, on account of the number twelve, may be brought into connection with the myth of the stars, or something similar, but still the names of the Twelve remain an unsolved riddle. It is certain that Jesus Himself, or His followers, employed ideas, expressions, imagery, symbolical acts, which were perhaps of great age, and had also, perhaps, been made use of in other religious communities. It may also have occurred that in recalling Jesus' life on earth such traits crept into the narrative. All this is conceivable, is frequently discussed, and taken for granted, in a greater or less degree, by many investigators. But even when this is the case to the extent which Drews endeavours to establish, it is precipitate and rash, to say the least of it, to conclude therefrom that the entire figure is unhistorical, and to simply forget that, after everything that is doubtful has been removed, there remains, of the Jesus tradition, an indissoluble residue which resists any and every attempt to demonstrate a mythological origin. And it is just here that Jesus bears those actual traits which prove His historical character.

We enjoy, today, the privilege of investigating old, non-Christian, religious customs and formulae, but to overlook such traits is an abuse of this privilege; our zeal as a discoverer would, in so doing, have carried us away, have rendered us rash and precipitate. Even when the imagery of the lamb, or the dove, or the vine, or the shepherd has been employed in a religious sense in other forms of worship, why is it then impossible in every way for Jesus to have used them? Was it absolutely necessary for Him to be original in every expression, every figure of speech? Why must

He only say what had never been said before? Why should He not make use of this old imagery, with which His hearers were familiar, just as He made use of the language, spoken and understood by His surroundings? And is it really the case that two people living quite independently of one another in India and in Palestine might not happen to use a dove or a shepherd as a figure of speech? Have perhaps the pastoral songs of our love-poets their origin in Old or New Testament imagery of shepherds? And even if here and there, in earlier times, thoughtful people, meeting together, had lent a deeper meaning to the customs of the common meal, or to the means of sustenance itself, to the bread and wine, so that this feeling was already awakened, why should Jesus then abstain from instituting something similar? And if the profound truth of the one suffering for the many, and of the sacrificial power of a voluntary death, and the boldest and most profound thought of all, that of a God offering himself as a sacrifice, had been proclaimed before and had grown into a myth, why, when this truth was once realised in a life, should it be considered a myth? And if the form of the cross is to be found in all kinds of symbolical drawings and representations — it is quite clear that all kinds of deep-felt truths may be expressed by the two transverse lines or staves — why must an execution on the cross be a fiction which arose from its symbolic nature and from the persuasions of the people of its deep, religious influence? Shall we, on this account, strike out of history the punishment of death on the cross, and relegate it to the realms of fiction, perhaps to the criminal romances of old times? That would be very consequent! Besides, Drews' analogies drawn from other religions do not coincide with the occurrences related in the Gospels.

It is not a picture, neither is it a doll which was hanged on the cross; it was no criminal that was bound to the stake. But an innocent being was formally condemned to death on the cross, and hung on the cross. It is without importance for the historical character of the crucifixion of Jesus whether this "cross" was only one piece of wood, or whether it had a cross-beam, and also whether the latter representation is a later one and influenced by old symbols. No historical fact is attested with greater certainty than the crucifixion is attested by St. Paul. He speaks of it without any allusion to a symbolical meaning of the "cross", without any play of thought, in a conspicuously simple manner, as precisely as possible, in the words we have quoted before: "He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil. 2,8); "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." (Gal. 3, 13.)

Lastly, the writings themselves, the Gospels, gainsay any mythological origin of the picture of Jesus which they bring. When we read them without prejudice we see clearly that they have no intention of demonstrating how a God Saviour became man, but that a man was the Messiah promised by the Prophets and desired by the people. And this in spite of all that was human in His nature, in spite of His want of success, in spite of the lack of all the features and signs of Divine glory, and in spite of His shameful death on the cross which led even His nearest disciples to doubt Him. He was no God Saviour, but just the Messiah, who, after having died on the cross, was raised to the right hand of God and could then complete His work for men. This last is a particularly strong argument against Drews. The Primitive Christians did not consider the work perfected and accomplished by Jesus' death — this was the belief of those who worshipped a self-sacrificing god — on the contrary, it was only begun, only rendered possible. What was most important was still to come, and this was not the result of a sacrifice, but that He Himself, raised to glory, would by His power and His spirit, raise men to glory. This central idea of the Christian faith has no analogy in any of the myths about a dying god. The god does indeed live again, but only to die again, in no case does he begin after death to accomplish his work. And this idea, which is peculiar to Christianity, is only to be understood as a continuation of the mighty impression made by the person of Jesus, which was increased by the way He suffered and died and which grew into infinite power — the power of raising His followers above things temporal — when He, the Master, was delivered from the finite conditions of this world and worked in His people as a glorified spirit.

There is no doubt that the Christ idea — that is to say, the hope of a Redeemer of the world, sent by God, together with an ideal picture of him — had long been in existence and had been developed in many different ways. The belief that this Redeemer had appeared in Jesus may also have influenced the picture of Jesus in the memory. But this Christ Jesus, who now lived in the belief of the Christians, was no longer the vague, fantastic Christ picture of the future, which excited the enthusiasm of the Jews; it was now a clearly outlined, vivid, human picture; it bore the features of the historic Jesus.⁴ It was now moved from the future, to which it had been banished, to the present and to the past, and indeed to the past in which they themselves had lived. And this event was the rock upon which they felt safe, in spite of the waves of mockery, of hate, and of persecution which surged around them. This transformation of a figure of the future into a hero of the present is decidedly not explained by Drews' formula of the combi-

nation of the Jewish cult-god Jesus from old times, and the heathen, self-sacrificing God Saviour from mythical heights. Something must have happened which entirely changed their whole position and converted them from enthusiasts whose hope lay in the future, to believers in a hero of the present. Should we ignore the historical character of Jesus then the whole origin of Primitive Christianity, in spite of many a trait which shows relationship with myths, with forms of worship and ideas, would become a psychological and historical riddle.

There is one more objection and the last. It is said that the moral ideas, which are embodied in Jesus, are not new. Also that the religious and moral teaching, attributed to Him, has all been pronounced somewhere else and at some other time in quite a similar way. Even if we grant that this is the case the picture of Jesus still remains quite unique. All these ideals are embodied here in a perfect and vivid human picture, in which everything foreign to these ideals is wanting. How much dross do we find mixed with the ideals of other teachers! And, lastly, here we have not only to do with a teacher of these ideals, but with One who lives for them and them alone, and is not, at the same time, a religious philosopher, or a scribe, or a champion of ancient and sacred forms of worship. We must notice just as much what Jesus has not advocated, what He has rejected, as what He has retained, and alone retained, in contrast to all others. This marvellously accurate choice is, at least, peculiar to Jesus. Others before him, Greeks and Romans, have certainly promoted universal love of mankind, but no one has found the combination: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" nor the categorical saying: "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." The collected petitions of the Lord's Prayer may have been already offered singly, and formulated similarly, but this demarcation of the prayerful thoughts of true piety is unique. Religious people, may, now and again, have believed that God was their Father, and they were His Children. But to see only the Father in God, to be assured of being His Son, and therefore raised above the world to perfect freedom, and yet to lay down His life, to bring it as a sacrifice for the sins of this world: this ideal is only embodied in the figure of Jesus, and in Him alone. Single analogies may therefore be produced for everything, but the whole story is unique and actual. And Drews has not even attempted to explain why and under what influence that Jesus hero of old legend, or the mythological God Saviour, was developed by the Christians into such a moral, religious ideal of humanity. But quite apart from all this: How was it possible that among a people, whose literature shows no tendency to anything similar, such a sharply defined, vivid picture,

drawn with a few simple strokes, could be evolved from the nebulous outlines and vague character of this mythological, fictitious being. We might call the picture a series of snap-shots, all harmonising in the delineation of the principal figure, which is given with really classical accuracy. And what makes this literary and psychological miracle still more marvellous is that this result is attained in spite of the picture of Jesus being brought into the closest connection with the highly fantastic picture of the hoped-for Messiah.

CONCLUSION.

We have finished. All the authorities have been soberly and carefully taken into account with the result that the historical character of Jesus is seen to be firmly anchored in history. There is no lack of non-Christian testimony to this from a period quite close to the time when Jesus was on earth. We know of the information received by the Emperor Claudius about A. D. 50, and by the Emperor Nero about A. D. 60. The belief of the Apostle Paul rests entirely on the crucified Jesus. The origin of the accounts, given in our Gospels, would, if they were not based upon historical facts, be an inscrutable riddle. On the other hand, the assumption that the picture of Jesus is a Christ myth, which has taken form and substance, rests on no solid foundation whatever and is encumbered with so many internal and external improbabilities and impossibilities that, to champion it, a high degree of credulity is necessary, which dispenses with all and any kind of criticism.

In opposition to this, the analysis, lying before us, will have made clear that the assertion of Jesus having lived, the outlines of His life, and a series of characteristic features of His picture have been handed down to us by reliable witnesses. This is no opinion formed by faith from which one may be dispensed, but is the guaranteed result of historical research, of an unprejudiced, conscientious, exhaustive examination of the mass of material proffered.

In making this enquiry any expression of opinion with regard to the value of what is discussed has been intentionally avoided; the documents were to speak for themselves. Historical facts were the subject of the debate. The historical method was necessary for the settlement of the matter.

It is quite another question what our personal relation is to these historical facts, what our opinion of them is, and what influence they exercise upon our own thoughts and life. Only faith can speak here. Faith alone can decide, is alone able to grasp and test the powers ruling these facts. But independent of all this and firmly based on history is the fact: Jesus has lived.

**New Publications
of the same publishing-house:**

The Twofold Gospel in the New Testament.
By Professor Harnack, D. D. of Berlin . . . 6 d. net.

**Does the New Testament gain or lose in
Significance for Religious Life by
Historical Criticism?**

By Professor von Soden, D. D. of Berlin . . . 6 d. net.

**The History of Religion and the Science
of the Old Testament.**

By Professor Gunkel of Giessen 6 d. net.

**Philosophy and Theology in the
Nineteenth Century.**

By Professor Dorner, D. D. of Königsberg . . 1 s. net.

Evolution and Ethics.

By Professor Titius of Göttingen 9 d. net.

**Theological Study in its Relation to the
Church.**

By Professor Weinel of Jena 6 d. net.

The Art of Preaching in Germany.

By Professor Niebergall of Heidelberg . . . 6 d. net.

Religious Education in Germany.

By Professor Baumgarten of Kiel 6 d. net.

**The Significance of the Personality
of Jesus.**

By Professor Bousset of Göttingen 6 d. net.

**German Philosophy and the Religious
Reform-Movement of to-day.**

By Professor Rudolf Eucken of Jena . . . 6 d. net.

**The Organization of the Protestant
Church in Germany.**

By Pfarrer D. Erich Foerster of Frankfurt a. M. 6 d. net

The Possibility of Free Christianity.

By Professor Troeltsch of Heidelberg 6 d. net.

**Ecclesiastical Liberalism and the
Free Religious Communities.**

By Professor Schieler of Danzig 6 d. net.

**The Significance
of Judaism for Religious Progress.**

By Professor Cohen of Marburg 6 d. net.

What we want

By Professor Schrempf of Stuttgart 6 d. net.

The Religion of Goethe and Schiller.

By Pfarrer Jaeger of Freiburg i. Br., and Bornhausen,
Licentiate in Marburg 9 d. net.

**The Religious Views of Bjoernson
and Ibsen.**

By Pfarrer Janson of Christiania 6 d. net.

God and Religions.

By Dr. Lhotzky, Ludwigshafen 6 d. net.

**The Theological and Practical
Issues of Biblical Criticism.**

By Professor Bacon, Newhaven 9 d. net.

**A Survey of Liberal Religion in the
United States.**

By Rev. Thomas Slicer, M. A. of New York City 6 d. net.

**Le Christianisme Progressif et la Religion
de l'Esprit.**

Par Etienne Giran, pasteur, Amsterdam . . 3 d. net.

Protestantischer Schriftenvertrieb

G. m. b. H.

Berlin-Schöneberg.

Proceedings and Papers
of the fifth Internat... Christianity
an



GTU Library

3 2400 00536 5212

Held at Berlin, Germany, August 5—10, 1910

„Einheit durch Freiheit“

PRICE: £ 2 10 S

CO

I. Foreword.

By Rev. J. Estlin
Oxford, England. Principal of Manchester College,

II. General Summary.

By Rev. C. H. Soden Secretary of the Congress.

III. List of the

1910—1913.

IV. List of the

Annual Meetings on
Social Question.

V.

Adresses of: Prof. Dr. T. G. Masaryk of the University of Prague; Dr. H. Herod of Lausanne, President of the International Temperance Bureau; Mr. H. G. Chancellor, M. P. of London; Rev. Falck of Berlin; Prof. Dr. W. Rauschenbusch of Rochester, U. S. A.

3. Religion and Temperance.

Addresses of: Miss Dr. Gertrud Bäumer of Berlin, Germany; Miss Helene von Dungern of Darmstadt, Germany; Miss Hedwig Winnecke of Strassburg, Germany; Mrs. Elsbeth Kruckenberg of Kreuznach, Germany; Mrs. Prof. Weinel, Dr. of Philosophy, of Jena, Germany; Mrs. Rev. Emile M. Jones, D. D., of Waterloo, Iowa, S. S. A.; Mrs. Clara T. Guild of Boston, Principal Tuckerman School for Pastor's Assistants; Mrs. Herbert Smith of London; Miss Helen Herford of London.

4. Religion and Universal Peace.

Addresses of: Prof. D. Martin Rade of the University of Marburg, Germany; Rev. Nithack-Stahn of Berlin, Germany; Rev. Francke of Berlin, Germany; Rev. Sigmund-Schultze of Potsdam, Germany, Secretary of the Anglo-German Peace Committee; Mr. J. Allen Baker, M. P. President of the Anglo-German Peace Congree; Dr. W. Blake Odgers, K. C., of London, Director of Legal Studies at the Inns-of-Court; Prof. Th. Ruysen of Bordeaux, France, President of L'Association de la Paix par le Droit; Dr. David Starr Jordan, of California. President of Stanford University.

VI. Sermons preached at the Religious Service of the Congress,
August 7th.

By Rev. G. Schönholzer of Zürich; by Rev. Wm. G. Tarrant of London;
by Rev. J. Emile Roberty of Paris.

VII. Opening Session of the Congress.

President's Address by Hon. Karl Schrader, M. P., of Berlin, Germany.

VIII. Secretarial Report.

By Rev. Chas. W. Wendte, D. D., of Boston, U. S. A.

IX. First Principal Theme of the Congress: „What Religious Liberals of Other Nations owe to the Religious and Theological Science of Germany.“

Addresses of Prof. Dr. J. Estlin Carpenter, Principal of Manchester College, Oxford; Prof. Dr. Francis G. Peabody of Harvard University; Prof. Dr. Edward C. Moore of Harvard University; Prof. Dr. G. Bonet Maury of the Free Faculty of Protestant Theology, Paris; Prof. Dr. H. Y. Groenewegen of Leiden University; Rev. Ter-Minassianz of Armenia; Rev. Tudor Jones of New Zealand.

X. Second Principal Theme of the Congress: „A Presentation of German Theology and German Church Life.“

Addresses of: Prof. D. D. Adolf Harnack, Berlin: „The double Gospel in the N. T.“; Prof. Dr. H. von Soden of the University of Berlin: „The Result of Scientific Study of the N. T.“; Prof. D. Hermann Gunkel of the University of Giessen: „The History of Religion and the Science of the O. T.“; Prof. D. August Dörner of the University of Koenigsberg: „Philosophy and Theology in the 19th Century“; Prof. D. Arthur Titius of the University of Goettingen: „Evolution and Ethics“; Prof. D. Heinrich Weinel of the University of Jena: „Theological Study in its Relation to the Church“; Prof. Friedrich Niebergall of the University of Heidelberg: „The Art of Sermon in Germany“; Prof. D. Otto Baumgarten of the University of Kiel: „The Religious Education in Germany“; Prof. D. Wobbermin of the University of Breslau: „Problem and Significance of Religion-Psychology“; Prof. D. Wilhelm Boussel of the University of Göttingen: „The Importance of the person of Jesus“; Rev. Dr. Erich Feuerstet of Frankfurt a. M.: „The Organization of the Protestant churches in Germany“; Prof. Dr. Ernst Troeltsch of the University of Heidelberg: „The Possibility of a Free Christianity“.

XI. Papers by Foreign Delegates.

Prof. Henry P. Forbes, D. D., of Canton, N. Y.; Prof. Benjamin W. Bacon, D. D., of Yale University, New Haven; Rev. Thomas R. Sleeter of New York, U. S. A.; Principal H. C. Maitra of Calcutta, India; Prof. Vaswani of Karachi, India; Prof. Dr. B. D. Eerdmans of the University of Leiden; Prof. Dr. H. von Merczyng of St. Petersburg, Russia; Prof. Clayton Bowen of Meadowville, U. S. A.; Prof. Dr. George Beres of Koloszvar, Hungary; Rev. Kristofer Janson of Christiania, Norway; Rev. Dr. Et. Giran of Amsterdam.

XII. Third Principal Theme of the Congress: „The Sympathetic Relations which should exist between the different religious denominations in Christendom.“

1. Between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Addresses by: M. Paul Sabatier, Paris; Don Romulo Murri of Rome; Rev. A. L. Lilley of London; Dr. Funk of Stettin, Germany.

2. Between Christians and Jews.

Addresses by: Rev. Dr. F. W. Perkins of Lynn, Mass.; Prof. Dr. Emil Hirsch of Chicago; Professor Dr. Hermann Cohen, University of Marburg; Mr. Claude Montefiore of London.

3. Between Christians and Free-Thinkers.

Addresses by: Professor Dr. C. Schieler of Danzig, Germany; Mrs. Dr. Hartwich of Koenigsberg, Germany; Dr. Lipsius of Bremen, Germany; Pasteur Wilfried Monod of Paris; M. Paul Hyacinthe Leyson of Paris.

4. Between Individualists and the Sects, and between the Sects themselves.

Addresses by: Prof. Dr. Christoph Schrempf of Stuttgart, Germany; Dr. Heinrich Lhotzky of München, Germany; Rev. D. Appeldorn of Emden, Germany; Rev. T. Rhondda Williams of Brighton, England.

XIII. Fourth Principal Theme of the Congress: „The Sympathetic Relations which should exist between Christianity and the other great World-faiths.“

Addresses by: Prof. Dr. E. Montet of Geneva; Rev. H. Minami of Tokyo, Japan; Prof. D. B. Jayatilaka of Colombo, Ceylon; Editor Promotho Loll Sen of Calcutta, India; Principal Heramba Chandra Maitra of Calcutta, India.

XIV. Closing Session, August 10th.

Address of: Père Hyacinthe Leyson of Paris. Hon. Karl Schrader.

XV. Supplementary Addresses at Weimar.

Prof. Dr. Rudolf Eucken of Jena, Germany; Rev. Paul Jaeger of Karlsruhe, Germany; Lic. Karl Bornhaugen of Marburg, Germany.

At Eisenach.

Addresses by: Prof. Schmiedel.